

**Echoes of Paine:
Tracing *The Age of Reason*
through the Writings of Emerson**

Joe Webb

In our country's brief history, no philosopher has cast a longer shadow over the great plains of American thought than Ralph Waldo Emerson, the prolific "sage of Concord." An active lecturer and essayist for more than fifty years, Emerson has been revered since his death by a wide range of Americans—from presidents to novelists to humble outdoorsmen. Even Woody Hayes, the controversial Ohio State football coach of the 1960s and 70s, declared that when it came to literature, Emerson was the captain of his starting eleven (Mott 64). A staple of the American literary canon, the revered writer and speaker is widely credited by high school teachers nationwide with championing the mid-nineteenth-century transcendental movement, bringing Americans closer to nature, and developing a new national identity based on self-reliance. All of these statements are largely true, but unfortunately their widespread acceptance has contributed to the American myth of Emerson, a myth that obscures certain other aspects of his philosophy. Though almost sanctified now, the great thinker was in his day the acme of radicalism—particularly in the theological community. As Donald Gelpi notes in his chronicle of Emerson's spiritual quest, "religious passion inspired almost everything Emerson wrote" (3), and thus we would be foolish to ignore the theological roots of Emerson's essays. The very skepticism that led Emerson away from orthodox Christianity also led to the development of his transcendental spirituality, and ultimately to his status as a present-day icon of American individualism.

We see this skepticism throughout the writings of Emerson, where we are presented with the picture of a man struggling to achieve a more personal relationship with the God of creation. In his essays and lectures, he challenges his audience to pursue this same line of inquiry, most notably in "The Divinity School Address" of 1838. Over time and through this incred-

ible struggle (along with the help of Henry David Thoreau and Bronson Alcott, among others), Emerson built an army of followers devoted to a transcendental reflection of God manifested in the daily surroundings of nature. The natural spirituality he espoused was both personally satisfying to his legion of devotees and rational in its empirical basis, emphasizing observation and reflection. In fact, during a series of lectures commemorating the work of Emerson in 1885, three years after his death, Edwin Meade told a Boston crowd that "The Divinity School Address" was "the first free and full utterance of rational religion in America" (235). Though it is true that Emerson's address was "free and fully rational," he was not the first person in America to make his transcendental claims. Meade went on to state incorrectly that "of all the great religious thinkers of America, and almost of our time altogether, Emerson has been perhaps the most impatient of the Church and its doctrinal statements" (237). Here again, the devoted follower of Emerson was either uninformed or unwilling to acknowledge the theological predecessors of Emerson. Many of the philosopher's thoughts can be found in the writings of scholars from the previous Age of Enlightenment, most specifically those who found support for their views on rational religion in the words of Thomas Paine, particularly the scientific deists and their seminal text—Paine's *The Age of Reason*. Echoes of Paine's work can be found throughout Emerson's most famous essays.

Another 1885 quote by Meade can serve as an introduction to Paine's influence on Emerson. In the opening of "Nature," Emerson speaks of a search for "an original relation to the universe." Meade explicates these lines, claiming that Emerson describes "the spirit . . . and it is in the enforcement of this that he comes into collision with the Church upon its three doctrines of Miracle, the Bible, and Christ. His demand throughout is for an original relation [to God] and a uniform and universal law" (239). Meade is in this instance correct in his assessment of Emerson's collision with the church. However, as accurate as Meade was in his description of Emerson's collision, he fails to acknowledge or recognize Emerson's debt to earlier sources. Emerson was certainly acquainted with Paine's theological ideas. Although he publicly branded Paine a "blasphemer" and an "infidel," the observations Paine makes in *The Age of Reason* permeate the religious writings of the surprisingly sympathetic transcendentalist.

To most Americans, Paine is an enigmatic figure at best, known to us as the author of *Common Sense* and an inciter of revolution, but also remembered as a man who had some quirky and nonconforming views about religion. Indeed, the mystery and confusion regarding Paine is nothing new. Nearly a hundred years ago, Theodore Roosevelt, who revered Emerson's "Self-Reliance," called Paine a "filthy little atheist" (Eric Foner 191). But contrary to the opinions of many since Roosevelt, these two men's

ideas about the *nature* of religion were so compatible that a discussion of one almost necessitates a discussion of the other. On the surface, perhaps one man found his God in Reason and the other in Nature, but a close textual analysis of their works shows that for Paine and Emerson Reason and Nature had almost identical meanings. However, before looking too deeply into the similarities between the work of Emerson and that of the deists, we need to examine the religious movement that used the author of *The Age of Reason* as its most visible spokesman.

Deism was grounded in Newtonian philosophy and codified its cardinal virtues as follows: 1) a belief in a universal First Cause wherein a Creator was responsible for existence; 2) the acceptance of a future state of being after death; and 3) a commitment to living virtuously while on Earth. Deists sought to strip Christianity of its necessary revelations, instead relying on the natural world as proof of the existence of a Divine Architect. In *The Age of Reason* Paine wrote "THE WORD OF GOD IS THE CREATION WE BEHOLD and it is in *this word*, which no human invention can counterfeit or alter, that God speaketh universally to man" (68). Rather than study the Bible, proponents of deism advocated a study of astronomy (the purest science) as the best way to learn more about God. As Emerson would rephrase the ideology some forty years later, "if a man would be alone, let him look at the stars" ("Nature" 28), in order that he might understand that God "speaketh, not spake" ("Divinity School" 78). Is it too obvious to state that this position of the deists made them detestable to clergy, or that deists returned the hatred with a force of equal or greater magnitude? Paine levels a number of accusations against the organized Church throughout *The Age of Reason*, most notably the charge that they created the Bible in an attempt to subjugate man and separate him from his Maker.

The most complete and accurate portrait of the deistic movement can be found in a seventy-one year-old book by Herbert Morais titled *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*. In this detailed history, Morais paints a picture of a faddish religion subscribed to by a freethinking group of wealthy renaissance men. According to his research, by "about 1750 . . . the *British Magazine* stated that half of the educated people of England were deists" (43). In addition to Paine, men like these would later draw their inspiration from such revolutionary deistic leaders as Benjamin Franklin, Thomas Jefferson, and Voltaire. Yet these intellectuals, with the exception of Paine, were generally leery of spreading this less than Christian faith to the masses. However, for the very reason that deism failed to resonate with a working populace grounded in an organized system of Christianity, its lifespan was terribly short. Franklyn Prochaska astutely notes that *The Age of Reason* was "the last representative of deism in decay" (576), but like the grand finale at a fireworks exhibition, the most explosive display was

saved for last. Nevertheless, although "the deistic movement waned and finally disappeared," it did not die (Roper 108). As Ralph Roper explains in his article depicting early deists as scientist-religionists, "an important outgrowth [of deism] was New England Transcendentalism." Roper quotes Woodbridge Riley: "It denied the need of miracle, revelation, [and a] dependence on an outward standard of faith; it affirmed the need of intuition, mystic ecstasy, [and an] inward dependence upon an immanent life" (108). In this claim Roper is correct; these transcendental ideas were derived from scientific deism.

Trying to evaluate to what extent *The Age of Reason* informed the early religious writings of Emerson, however, is tricky. Were Paine's spiritual writings a source for Emerson, or were the two scholars' ideas simply analogous? Similarities in each of the philosopher's works are too pronounced to ignore, and Emerson was obviously familiar with Paine's political and religious tracts. *The Age of the Reason* can be seen as both an analog to the writings of Emerson and as a source, whether or not he was influenced consciously by Paine's writing.

To date, the most extensive research in this field has been performed by the English historian George Spater, who along with Ian Dyck published a series of essays on Paine in 1988. In the book's concluding chapter, "The Legacy of Thomas Paine," Spater reasons that although Paine's writings had been out of print since the turn of the eighteenth century, they were still widely read, "perhaps in battered copies, by the students that attended Harvard" in the first few decades of the nineteenth century (140). Emerson, of course, was a student at Harvard from 1817 to 1821, and while there he voraciously inquired into the preceding generation's religious skepticism along with many of his classmates. Spater further notes that although "Paine's name does not appear in the [Divinity School] Address, nor in any of Emerson's talks or essays, Emerson's notes confirm that he read Paine, as could be assumed of any educated person of the time" (142). This quotation, however, is only partially true. While "The Divinity School Address" does not specifically refer to Paine, Emerson published the Address after an explicit warning that the ideas contained therein were derivative of the controversial deist. Following his delivery of the Address to the student body, his half-uncle Samuel Ripley wrote him a letter pleading that he not deliver the speech to his publisher, arguing that "the world needs to be enlightened—but I don't want to see you classed with Kneeland, Paine & co., bespattered and belied" (Letters 148). Spater also overlooked the fact that Paine's name does appear in Emerson's essay "Nominalist and Realist," where he is grouped in the company of "the coarsest blasphemers" (239).

The negative light into which these comments cast Paine is not unique to Emerson's half-uncle—most of his contemporaries did the same. Despite

the fact that the two philosopher's views of religion were overwhelmingly similar, Emerson repeatedly attempted to distance himself from the "bespattered and belied" Paine. For this, however, Emerson can hardly be blamed. Philip Foner notes in his introduction to *The Age of Reason* that upon Paine's statement of personal belief, he "was forced to endure a barrage of calumny and vituperation such as has been visited upon few men in our history" (35). Nevertheless, whether Emerson openly agreed with Paine or did his best to free himself from his philosophical forebear, he could not escape the echoes of *The Age of Reason* that resonate throughout his essays. Furthermore, each attempt to cut down Paine as an infidel only suggests that Emerson was in fact acquainted with his work.

There is further proof that Emerson himself was not so indifferent to Paine as his greatest champions would have us believe. Due to the extensive work of Walter Harding in cataloguing Emerson's library, we know that at the very least he possessed a first-run copy of Paine's *Common Sense*. Robert Richardson's biography *Emerson: Mind on Fire* also informs us that Emerson's father, William, possessed copies of the liberal religious texts written by Priestley and Paine—and that Emerson extensively studied the writings and library of his father (20). In his *Journal B*, which led to the topics of many of Emerson's essays, he reflects that "Paine & the infidels began with good intentions" (202), and in *Notebooks ZO*, Emerson quotes Pierre Etienne Dumont's idea of Tom Paine that "he knew all his own writings by heart, but he knew nothing else" (232). In short, we can assume that Emerson, through the course of his life-long education, had internalized Paine's controversial religious ideas. Although he was quick in public to label Paine a "blasphemer" or an "infidel," his own spiritual convictions reflected his familiarity with *The Age of Reason*.

Upon opening the text of Paine's work to the first page, anyone familiar with Emerson will immediately recognize a similarity in the two scholar's minds. Beginning with a call for open-mindedness, Paine implores his readers to remember that "I have always strenuously supported the right of every man to his own opinion, however different that opinion might be to mine. He who denies to another this right, makes a slave of himself to his present opinion, because he precludes himself the right of changing it" (49). How similar does this sound to one of the most often-quoted passages of "Self-Reliance," that "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds" (125)? Paine goes on, after a profession of faith in One God, to attack the bureaucratic and self-perpetuating nature of the organized church. Emerson, who resigned his position as junior pastor of Boston's Second Unitarian Church, could easily have made the following quotation about himself: "He takes up the trade of a priest for the sake of gain, and in order to qualify himself for that trade he begins with a perjury. Can we

conceive any thing more destructive to morality than this?" (Paine 51), yet it of course comes from Paine's assessment of the current state of the clergy in *The Age of Reason*. What is this great perjury that a man in tune with God's nature must make in order to be ordained? It is a disregard for the word of God by which he is daily surrounded; it is a blind faith in second-hand revelation and books of hearsay; and it is a promise to subjugate the self-evident truth of God's beneficence beneath a system of trickery and miracles in order to force the laity into a false conformity. For both Paine and Emerson, these lies were incompatible with true faith, and thus we can see a similar collision with the church on grounds of false miracle, false Bible, and false man-prophet-deity.

As science has progressed over the last few centuries, the existence of the miracle has become increasingly problematic for more liberal-minded theologians. If the Bible is to be interpreted as a divine text, inspired by the God of Christianity, then all of the texts contained therein must necessarily also be divinely accurate. John Mecklin framed the debate nicely in 1917 when he challenged dissenters among the Christian faith that "if we are to accept the records at all, we must recognize that miracle is an integral part of the early Christian world-view" (243). He then went on to pose this conundrum: "what we are really asked to believe is that there is a higher law of nature which at times interferes with natural law as we know it, although we have no information whatever as to the operation of this higher law" (248). Ultimately Mecklin (like large numbers in this country today), concluded that he would accept the truth of the miraculous despite the conflict in which it necessarily finds itself with modern science. Of course, those who choose to make this leap of faith, like Mecklin, only find their faith in God strengthened by arriving at the conclusion that miracles are true.

However, although neither Paine nor Emerson believed in miracles, their faith in One God never waned over the course of their lifetimes. Rather, through their distrust of unexplainable phenomena, they found a deeper need to rely on the primacy of intimate experience with God's natural world to validate their faith. Why did these men distrust the necessity for miracles as a foundation for a belief in God? Paine offers two reasons, both of which essentially argue that the existence of miraculous fables is inconsistent with the harmony of God's omnipotence: "In the first place . . . it implies a lameness or weakness in the doctrine that is preached. And, in the second place, it is degrading the Almighty into the character of a showman, playing tricks to amuse and make the people stare and wonder" (94). For Paine, the truth of God's existence, stamped upon the very face of the world, admits no need of a miracle to prove its veracity. Interestingly, critics of Paine's work would subsequently argue that the leap of faith necessary to acknowledge God as creator of the daily surrounding

world was no different from the leap of faith necessary to acknowledge the possibility of miracles. But Paine held firm, citing the detailed structure of the universe as evidence of its having been created. Further expounding upon his distrust of miracles, he wrote: "Instead of admitting the recitals of miracles as evidence of any system of religion being true, they ought to be considered as symptoms of its being fabulous" (96).

Regarding the necessity of miracles for religious indoctrination, Emerson felt as strongly inclined to disbelieve them as Paine. Following the deist's point to its logical conclusion in "The Divinity School Address," Emerson writes "to aim to convert a man by miracles, is a profanation of the soul" (74). Of course, in the evangelical ramifications of a statement like this, we can see his collision with the more conservative churches of New England. But Emerson rebutted the arguments of the church, noting like Paine that the existence of true miracles would degrade God into a showman incapable of capturing the world's attention without a flashbox or a hidden chamber. Because "God never jests with us," the soul can much better appreciate the truth of the deity if it is "very incurious concerning persons or miracles, and not at all disturbed by chasms of historical evidence, [if] it accepts from God the phenomenon, as it finds it, as the pure and awful form of religion in the world" ("Nature" 49). Anyone aware of the most rudimentary basics of transcendental thought can recognize the harmony the philosophy seeks to achieve between man and nature. This union is important, because Emerson argues that Nature is God's miracle, and the constant magnificence of its ever-present imprint upon our eyes renders all other smaller miracles unnecessary. Those religious leaders who would impose miracles upon the laity as a staple of their doctrine offer them nothing other than tricks or sleights-of-hand, both of which fall below the dignity of a God capable of creating this earth and all its majestic pomp of land, sky, and sea. The miracle is incompatible with natural science, but for both Paine and Emerson natural science only serves to confirm the existence of God.

Harkening back to Meade's 1885 address, we remember his second claim that Emerson was singularly unique among American theologians in his collision with the Church concerning the truth of the Bible. Here again, it will be seen that Emerson and the transcendentalists were simply treading upon ground already broken by Paine and the deists. In the opening sections of *The Age of Reason*, Paine lays out his reasoning for skepticism regarding the Bible. The Bible is revered by orthodox Judaic and Christian believers as having been divinely inspired by God, and its passages and stories are traditionally believed to have been passed along through direct revelation from the Word's Creator to the individual authors. But Paine claims semantically that a *revelation*, that direct disclosure of information from God to man, is only a revelation in the initial transaction, and afterwards

becomes *hearsay* in its transfer from the primary receiver to modern man. Although certainly never discounting the ability of an omnipotent God to disclose any information to mankind, Paine argues he would rather garner his knowledge of the Deity by direct reflection than through hearsay, which could or could not be true. Simply put, the Bible was nothing other than a book—at times a book filled with useful stories of men and moral maxims to be admired—but nevertheless a book like any other.

In "The American Scholar," Emerson famously lashes out against a reliance on books for information. The information contained in libraries (which he called the Third Estate) could never ably substitute for the truth-filled world outside our very windows. "Man thinking," he suggests, "must not be subdued by his instruments. Books are for the scholar's idle times. When he can read directly, the hour is too precious to be wasted in other men's transcripts of their readings" (60). For Paine, and most probably for Emerson, this maxim applied doubly to the Bible. It represented the transcripts of other men's readings of God. Paine wrote:

It is only in the CREATION that all our ideas and conceptions of a *Word of God* can unite. The creation speaks a universal language, independently of human speech of human language, multiplied and various as they be. It is an ever-existing original, which every man can read. It cannot be forged; it cannot be counterfeited; it cannot be lost; it cannot be altered; it cannot be suppressed. It does not depend upon the will of man whether it shall be published or not; it publishes itself from one end of the earth to the other. It preaches to all nations and to all worlds; and this *Word of God* reveals to man all that is necessary for man to know of God. (69)

Thus for Paine, because language is mutable, and the study of languages subsequently futile, the changeability across boundaries of nations and time make the Bible a poor substitute for God's actual revelation to the world. Rather, it would be in humankind's best interests to read the bible of nature while traversing the countryside: "Do we not see a fair creation prepared to receive us the instant we are born—a world furnished to our hands, that cost us nothing? Is it we that light up the sun, that pour down the rain, and fill the earth with abundance?" (58). Rather than killing spirituality by discrediting the Bible as the word of God, Paine and the deists sought to empower man to pursue a fresher, more lively relationship with the Creator of Nature.

In many ways, Paine never sounds more like Emerson than when he is championing Nature, and similarly Emerson never sounds more like Paine than when he is critiquing orthodox Christianity and its primary text. In "The Divinity School Address," Emerson follows Paine's reluctance to place too much emphasis on the words of others when he speaks to the future clergy: "Let me admonish you, first of all, to go alone; refuse the

good models, even those which are sacred in the imagination of men, and dare to love God without mediator or veil" (79). For these young Harvard divinity students, the Bible is the good model, held sacred by so many, that interferes as a mediator between the Deity and his creation. Emerson further expounds upon this idea of direct exposure to God's munificence in "Self-Reliance": "If therefore, a man claims to know and speak of God, and carries you backward to the phraseology of some old mouldered nation in another country, in another world, believe him not. Is the acorn better than the oak which is its fullness and completion?" (128). Twenty years previous to writing these lines, Emerson himself had faced the question of mediation between God and his creation. Clearly for both Paine and Emerson, an active reflection upon and interaction with God's creation was far superior to a second-hand acceptance of a philosophical ancestor's truth. These words, spoken by Emerson, could as easily have been spoken by his predecessor Paine: "I had better never see a book [the Bible included], than to be warped by its attraction clean out of my own orbit, and made a satellite instead of a system" ("American Scholar" 59).

Moving from a distrust of miracle and the Bible, both Paine and Emerson were placed in their most precarious position when they challenged the Church on Meade's third collision point—the divine nature of Jesus Christ. It is of course partially from the miraculous stories attributed to the birth and death of Jesus that Christianity draws its justification, and thus any attempt to undercut that truth would naturally lead to the "barage of calumny and vituperation" that was visited upon Paine. However, though Emerson tried to distance himself from Paine for this very reason, he too was ostracized for his skeptical public lectures. After "The Divinity School Address," Harvard banned Emerson from ever speaking on campus again, and did not rescind that ban until 1866, well after he had achieved his deserved status as a fixture in American philosophy. This, however, should not be surprising. At that time (and to this day), many Americans hoped for the redemption promised through the birth and death of Jesus. The attempt to take that hope away, or rather to question the need for that gateway to the next world, left those Americans hostile to Emerson and Paine's skeptical message.

Although both of these men refused to believe in the divinity of Christ, they publicly espoused the view that no better human being ever graced this earth with his presence. As Gelpi clarifies in his text scrutinizing the religious underpinnings of Emerson's work: "Emerson regarded Jesus as the most morally influential man who ever lived, a person of unparalleled magnanimity and spiritual greatness of soul. Emerson balked, however, at calling him a 'portion of the deity' in any unique sense of the term. At best, one can say that by his sensitivity to the spiritual influences of the

deity, Jesus exemplified in a singular manner the divine moral character" (29). This understanding of Christ reflects Paine's own view of the man. To both of these philosophers, Christ was the perfect teacher: "virtuous and amiable" according to Paine, but also too humble and accepting a man to force a system of religion on the world that by the late eighteenth and early nineteenth century had cycled back towards the closed-minded, and consequently, towards the hypocritical. Although Christianity borrowed its name from Jesus, the lessons he taught were more sympathetic to a transcendental worldview. Emerson claimed in the essay "Nature" that "the visible heavens and earth sympathize with Jesus" (33), and they did this because Jesus Christ served as the divine essence's most representative man—he lived a simple, philanthropic life and recognized the best qualities, those that make each of us divine, in each human being. As the author of *Representative Men*, Emerson was attempting, scholars have argued, to establish that divine essence, "most completely embodied in Jesus of Nazareth," in the "less balanced geniuses of history" like Montaigne or Shakespeare (Gelpi 95).

Roughly sixty years before the publication of *Representative Men*, Paine painted a nearly identical portrait of Christ's "true nature" in *The Age of Reason*. Wishing to strip the Western world's leading religion of its many false tenets without stripping any dignity from its namesake, he wrote that "nothing that is here said can apply, even with the most distant disrespect, to the real character of Jesus Christ The morality that he preached and practiced was of the most benevolent kind . . . it has not been exceeded by any" (53). Paine believed that the Church, however, had for many years ignored the principles taught by Christ, instead using the stories of his miraculous birth and death to justify the imposition of its own awful self-perpetuating tyranny on its subjects. For the deist, the story of Christ, at least the miraculous part, had "every mark of fraud and imposition stamped upon the face of it" (54). Paine accepted the truth of Christ having lived and taught, and he did not doubt that Christ had died by crucifixion, since it was the primary mode of execution in that day. He simply refused to believe the myths handed down about his ascension into Heaven. While Christianity continued to dwell on the demands of a fable, Paine preferred to follow the teachings of Jesus as a representative prototype for his own calling in life, that of a "virtuous reformer and revolutionist" (55). It is both telling and ironic that the words and lives of both Emerson and Paine more closely mirrored Jesus in their teaching and actions than did those of many clergy who labeled them heretics.

Although Paine found his God in reason and Emerson found his in nature, the two words effectively had the same meaning for each philosopher. As Roper notes, "one cannot rightly understand the scientific and religious

views of Paine, nor of Franklin, Jefferson and other Deists of their time . . . unless one realizes that they were essentially nature worshippers—God worshippers through nature” (101). In nature they found evidence of order and benevolence that could have only come from a munificent Creator; in nature they found both reason and *the reason* for living a simple, philanthropic life—much like the one led by Jesus.

Emerson worked along this same circle of thought, choosing, however, to follow the chain of logic to its tautological conclusion by going clockwise as opposed to counter: “That which, intellectually considered, we call Reason, considered in relation to nature, we call Spirit. Spirit is the Creator. Spirit hath life in itself. And man in all ages and countries, embodies it in his language, as the FATHER” (“Nature” 35-36). The self-evident truth found in God’s natural Creation impressed upon each man the need to dismiss as false the faulty doctrines of imposed religion found in the orthodox Church—a war that was waged upon Meade’s three battlefronts of collision. Clearly, Emerson was following in the footsteps of Paine, shadowing the steps of the deist and recreating his arguments for a new generation.

The echoes of Paine that are found in “The Divinity School Address” and Emerson’s other religious commentaries are themselves echoes of Voltaire, Hume, and Locke. Like Paine’s reliance on these writers, Emerson, despite his public denials, was preoccupied with Paine to the point that he understood and could harmonize with him. He internalized the ideas of his predecessor, reconstituting them as needed for a new era, just as others continue to borrow from Emerson into the twenty-first century. In “Self-Reliance,” Emerson tells us “society is a wave. The wave moves onward, but the water of which it is composed, does not” (136). Each philosophy or school of thought is like a rivulet that joins with others to form a river, and out of the confluence of deism and a few generations of time a new river is formed that can be called Transcendentalism. The myth propagated by men like Meade that Emerson’s skepticism was created out of a theological vacuum becomes nonsense as the water rolls on. A historical view of literature tells us that philosophy is dialectical, and we can better understand the work of Emerson by doing what Meade did not do: by listening to Emerson with a remembrance of Paine. If we first open our ears to the harmonious echoes of *The Age of Reason* found in “The Divinity School Address,” we can then understand that Paine’s words enrich the new notes that Emerson added to the skeptical melody of free thought coursing throughout the nineteenth century.

Works Cited

Emerson, Ralph W. "The American Scholar." Porte and Morris 66-69.

—. "The Divinity School Address." Porte and Morris 69-81.

—. *The Journals of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Vol. V. Ed. Merton Sealts, Jr. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1994.

—. *The Letters of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Vol. II. Ed. L. Rusk and Eleanor M. Tilton. New York: Columbia UP, 1939.

—. "Nature." Porte and Morris 27-55.

—. "Nominalist and Realist." *The Complete Works of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Vol. III. Boston: Houghton, 1968. 223-48.

—. "Self-Reliance." Porte and Morris 120-37.

—. *The Topical Notebooks of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Vol. III. Ed. Ralph Orth. Columbia: U of Missouri P, 1994.

Foner, Eric. *Tom Paine and Revolutionary America*. New York: Oxford UP, 1976.

Foner, Philip. Introduction. *The Age of Reason*. New York: Citadel, 1974.

Gelpi, Donald. *Endless Seeker: The Religious Quest of Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Lanham, MD: UP of America, 1991.

Meade, Edwin D. "Emerson's Ethics." *The Genius and Character of Emerson*. 1885. Ed. F. B. Sanborn. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat P, 1971.

Mecklin, John M. "The Survival Value of Miracle." *The American Journal of Theology* 21.2 (1917): 240-59.

Morais, Herbert. *Deism in Eighteenth Century America*. 1934. New York: Russell, 1960.

Mott, Wesley T. "'The Age of First-Person Singular': Emerson and Individualism." *A Historical Guide to Ralph Waldo Emerson*. Ed. Joel Meyerson. NY: Oxford UP, 2000. 61-100.

Paine, Thomas. *The Age of Reason*. 1795. New York: Citadel, 1974.

Porte, Joel, and Sandra Morris, eds. *Emerson's Prose and Poetry*. New York: Norton, 2001.

Prochaska, Franklyn. "Thomas Paine's *The Age of Reason* Revisited." *Journal of the History of Ideas* 33.4 (1972): 561-76.

Richardson, Robert D. *Emerson: The Mind on Fire*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.

Roper, Ralph C. "Thomas Paine: Scientist-Religionist." *The Scientific Monthly* 58. 2 (1944): 101-11.

Spater, George. "The Legacy of Thomas Paine." *Citizens of the World: Essays on Thomas Paine*. Ed. Ian Dyck. New York: St. Martin's, 1988.

Copyright of ATQ is the property of University of Rhode Island and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.